ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

NEW PHRYGIAN ετι AND τι

I. ετι

1. In New Phrygian (NPhr.), one has generally assumed two words ετι (cf. Haas 1966: 96, Brixhe 1978a: 12, Heubeck 1987: 72 and fn. 6, etc.): a conjunction with a meaning comparable to that of Gr. ἔτι, and a preverb or emphatic particle immediately preceding the participle (τ)τετικμενος 'cursed'.

The former meaning is based on two inscriptions where NPhr. ετι stands between κ(ι)νουμα and μ(α)νκαν: κινουμα ετι μνκαν οπεσταμε-ναν δαδιτι Νενυεριαι (9)[1] 'made a grave and a standing monument for Nenueria' *uel sim.* and κνουμα ετι δεαδα μανκαν (18). As both κ(ι)νουμα and μ(α)νκα- must be parts of the grave, cf. ιος νι σεμον κνουμανε κακον δακετ αινι μανκα τιετιττετικμενος ειτου (26) 'whoever brings harm to this κνουμαν (grave?) or μανκα (monument?), let him be cursed', it seems probable that κ(ι)νουμα and μ(α)νκα- are correlated and that ετι is a conjunction meaning something like 'and'[2].

2. Closer inspection of the occurrences of ετι(τ)τετικμενος shows, however, that this word most probably does not exist. The dossier of ετι(τ)τετικμενος based on the texts as given by Haas and Brixhe (cf. fn. 1) can be divided into several categories (in the following I mostly give only the apodosis of the malediction formulae):

---

[1] The numbers of the NPhr. inscriptions refer to: Haas 1966: 114—129 (Nos. 1—110), Brixhe 1978a: 3—7 (No. 111—114), Brixhe-Waelkens 1981 (No. 115). Brixhe-Neumann 1985 (No. 116). The numbers of the OPhr. inscriptions refer to Brixhe-Lejeune 1984.

[2] In Old Phrygian (OPhr.), the sequence *eti* occurs only in *etitevtevey* (B-03), which can be analysed *eti-tevtevey*. The form *tevtevey* strongly reminds one of *anevnevey* of the so-called Myso-Phrygian inscription, published for the first time by Cox and Cameron (1932) and included by Friedrich in his Kleinasiatische Sprachdenkmäler (1932: 140). Cox and Cameron transliterate this word as *anevnevei* (Friedrich as *anevnevez*), but Lejeune (1969: 47) proposed to transliterate the final sign of this word as a yod. The division *eti-tevtevey* being confirmed by *a-nevnevey*, we may restore *t]evtevey* at the beginning of line 2 of the same inscription B-03 (the end of line 1 is illegible).

a. In ten inscriptions the sequence ετι(τ)τετικμενος has been restored and is thus useless as evidence:

— δη διως ζεμελω[ς ετιττετ]ικμενος ειτου (4); restoration δη διως ζεμελω[ς τιτ τετ]ικμενος ειτου is equally possible and is given by Calder (1911: 166).

— [ετιτ]ετικμενος ειτου (10); restoration [τιτ τ]ετικμενος is more probable and was already proposed by Calder (1911: 169).

— [ετι]τετικ[μ]ε/[νος α]ττι αδε/[ι]του (11); Calder (1911: 170) reads [τι]τετικμε/[νος].

— ιος σεμου κνου/μανει κα[κον] ⟨αδδακετ⟩ ετιτετεικμενος ειτο[υ] (19). The scribe apparently left out a part of the inscription, so that we do not know where the lacuna ends.

— ιος νι σεμουν κν[ου]/μμανει κακουν [α]/δδακεττ [ạ]ικ[ạ]ι [ε]/ τιτ τετικμεν[ος] ας τιαν ειτου (53) (for αικαι cf. Brixhe 1979: 180); restoration of the ε at the end of line 3 is unnecessary.

— [ι]ος σας του σκερεδ̣/ριας κακουν δακετ [.]/ẹιττετικμενος [..../ .]αττιε ειτου (56). This is the text given by Haas (1966: 122), who remarks: "Wohl doch [ε]/[τ]ιττετικμενος". According to Calder's drawing (1911: 199), however, the τ of δακετ stands exactly under the δ of the previous line (σκερεδ̣/), so that it is probable that the line ends with δακετ. The first letter of the next line looks like σ or ε in the drawing, but it could also be a ṭ. The rest of the line seems to be intact, so that I read: [ι]ος σας του σκερεδ̣/ριας κακουν δακετ/ ṭιτ τετικμενος/ αττιε ειτου.

— αττι/η [ẹτ]ιτ[τ]ετικμενο[ς αδ]ειτου (65). According to Calder's drawing (1911: 211), there is no room for two letters at the beginning of line 2. Calder reads A]ττι/η [θ]ιτ[τ]ε[τ]ικμενο[ς and remarks: "the second letter in line 2 is almost certainly O, not E". We may perhaps read αττιη θιτ [τ]ετικμενο[ς and assume that θ is a mistake for the usual τ. This inscription is found in Kurşunlu, to the north of Iconium, in which region alternations between tenuis and aspirata are usual (for Cilicia cf. Neumann 1986: 82, for Lycaonia Laminger—Pascher 1984: 14).

— ιος νι ⟨σ⟩εμ[ον κνουμανε κα]/κουν αδακε[ ]/ ετι[τ]τετικ[μενος ειτου] (68). The right side of the stone is absent (cf. Calder 1913: 98). Calder restores the second line as /κουν αδακε[τ, δεως ζεμελως]. However, the restoration of the first line requires 13 or 14 omitted letters rather than 12, as given by most scholars, because σεμουν is preferable in view of κακουν, which most frequently has the same form as the preceding pronoun (cf. Neumann 1970: 212 f.), and κνουμανει occurs often than κνουμανε. I would therefore propose the following

restoration: ιος νι ⟨σ⟩εμ[ουν κνουμανε κα]/κουν αδακε[τ δεως ζεμελως κ]/ε τι[τ] τετικ[μενος ειτου]. See further ad **c.**

— τις κ εγερε[τ ε]/τιττετικμ[ε]νοι ιννου (71); the restoration is uncertain.

— ...]/ ε[τι]/ττετικμενος ειτο[υ] (91); the part of the inscription preceding the ε, is illegible, so that the restoration is uncertain.

b. In two cases the reading of the inscription must be corrected:

— με διω[ς ζ]ομολω ετιτετικμενος ητον (5); as both ε and σ have a round shape in this inscription, the reading ζ]ομολως τι τετικμενος is not only possible (cf. Ramsay 1905: col. 79 ff.; Brixhe 1978b: 1, fn. 2), but even preferable because δεως and ζεμελως in nine of the eleven occurrences have the same ending (Brixhe 1979: 185, fn. 27).

— ις ετιτετουκμενουν ειτου (28) must be read ιος τι τετουκμενουν ειτου (cf. Brixhe 1978a: 17, who follows Calder's reading in 1933: 89; cf. also the photograph on pl. 52).

c. In nine inscriptions we find κετι(τ)τετικμενος, which is mostly divided κ' ετι(τ)τετικμενος with elision of κε. However, the division κε τι(τ) τετικμενος is not only possible, but preferable, as the elision of κε in the position before ε- does not take place everywhere and was probably facultative. The ε is elided in γεγρειμεναν/-ον κ' εγεδου (76, 106), cf. γεγρειμεναν εγεδου (32, 33, 34, 36, 59, 60, 105), but, on the other hand, we find κε εν σταρνα in 48 (Brixhe 1878a: 11), εναρκε ερμωλος and κε ε̣ντοισ̣ινιοι in 116. The division of κεροκα (33) and κοροκα (36) is unclear.

— [δεως κε ζεμελως κ]ε τι ετιττετικμενος ειτου (3); for the restoration cf. Brixhe 1978a, p. 12; for the second ετι see below, sub **e.**

— ζειρα κε οι πειες κε τιτ τετικμενα ατ̣τι[ε] αδειττνου (12).

— δ̣ιος [κ]ε σ̣ζεμελως κ̣ε τιτ [τ]ε[τ]ικμε̣ν̣[ος] ειτο[υ] ατ̣τιη κε αδειτου (39).

— δεως ζεμελως κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (40).

— αικαν ατ̣τιη κε δεως κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (62).

— [ζεμ]ελως{ι} κε δεως [κε ατ̣τιε] κε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] (92).

— με δεως κε ζεμελως κε τι τετικμενος ειτου (96).

— με ζε⟨με⟩λως κε δεως κε τιετιτετικμ[ενος ειτου] (97); for the second ετι see below, sub **e.**

— με σζεμελως κε δυως κε τιτ [τετικμενος ειτου] (113).

d. Twice ετι(τ)τετικμενος is found after ατ̣τι, where we must rather read ατ̣τιε τι τετικμενος ειτου, cf. for this formula τι(τ) τετικμενος ατ̣τιε αδειτου (45, 61, 70, 100) or ατ̣τιε ειτου (56):

— αττιε τι τετικμενος ειτου (94).
— [ατ]τιε τι τετικμενος ειτ[ου] (102); the restoration of Calder 1956: p. 21 f., No. 108, cf. the drawing on p. 228.

e. The remaining material is confined to ten occurrences after τι(τ) (for which see below. §§ 8 ff.), where the division τιε τι(τ) τετικμενος seems preferable (see further § 3):
— τιε τιτ [τ]ετικμενος ειτου (2).
— [δεως κε ζεμελως κ]ε τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (3); for the first ετι see above, sub **c**.
— τος νι με ζεμελω κε δεος [κ/]ε τιη τιτ τετικμενος ε[ιτ]ου (6); for the reading cf. Brixhe 1978b: 1.
— δεος κε ζεμ[ελω . . . .]ακε οι ειροια τιε τιτ τ[ετικμενοι ειττ]νου (7); for ειροια cf. Brixhe 1978b: 9; alternatively, one may divide to read ειροι ατιε (see further ad **d**).
— τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (26).
— ζεμελως ιτε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (75); Brixhe 1978a: 10—1 proposes to see in ιτε a mistake for τιε.
— με ζε⟨με⟩λως κε δεως κε τιε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] (97); for the first ετι see above, sub **c**.
— με δεως τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (112).
— τιη τι τ[ετικμενο]ς ειτου (114).
— τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (115).

3. I thus propose to divide τιε/ητι(τ)τετικμενος ειτου of the last ten inscriptions as τιε/η τι(τ) τετικμενος ειτου and translate 'let him become accursed by (the god) Tiyes'[3]. The formula τιε/η τι(τ) τετικμενος is then comparable to αττιε τι τετικμενος ειτου (94, 102) or αττιη κε τι τετικμ[ε]/νος ειτου (86), only without the preposition αδ (on these formulae and the god Tiyes cf. below §§ 5—6). There are several considerations in favour of this analysis:

a. The alternation τιε ~ τιη strongly recalls that of αττιε ~ αττιη. If we look at the distribution of η in the NPhr. inscriptions, we see that η practically never appears in word-initial position:
as word-initial: ητον (5) "für sonstiges *eitou* (angelehnt an griechisch ἤτω)" (Haas 1966: 202);
in inlaut: μαιμαρηαν (31), τιηιον (58);

[3] When the present paper had already been written, I learned that Prof. M. N. van Loon had reached the same conclusion several years ago in an unpublished article 'Some Remarks on the Phrygian Inscriptions'.

in the ending -ης: δεκμουταης (31 vs. δεκμουταις in 9), παρτης (42, 87), αλεντατης (69), μανκης (86), πατερης (98), δ.κερης (116);
as word-final: δη (4), Ξευνη (15 vs. Ξευνε 31, 69), κνουμανη (115 vs. κνουμανε(ι) or κνουμανι passim), εκατη (or εκατης, 116), and αττιη (39, 62, 65, 86 vs. αττι(ε) passim and ατι 87, 103[4]);
uncertain: σιβη[(30), αυτω αυτα ηκετ αν ... (30; so Haas 1966: 111, but Calder 1956: 39, No. 195, reads ακκολταηκεταν, which rather points to division ακκολταη κε ταν),]τη[(42),]εμερη[(72).

One can agree with Haas that "der Buchstabe η, der im Griechischen bereits annähernd = *i* lautete, bezeichnet ein stark geschlossenes *e*. Er wird besonders dann verwendet, wenn *i* im Spiele ist" (1966: 202). The distribution of η thus shows that the analysis of ητιττετικμενος in 6 and 114 as ητι- with η- instead of ε- is improbable.

b. It is striking that, in ten inscriptions with τιε/ητι(τ)τετικμενος, we find no αττιε/η or αστιαν formulae, whereas the vast majority of the τετικμενος curses do contain them. This indicates that the god is already mentioned in τιε/ητιττετικμενος.

c. The NPhr. malediction formulae generally make explicit by whom the violator of the tomb will be cursed: we find constructions with αττιε and αστιαν, with δεως ζεμελως, etc. It seems significant that in the whole corpus there are but four more or less complete inscriptions, viz. 10, 28, 71, 82, where τετικμενος is used without a complement.

d. Only in two inscriptions, viz. 67 and 78, is τετικμενος not preceded by τι(τ), so that the analysis of the text with τι(τ) immediately preceding τετικμενος is *a priori* more probable. For the problem of gemination see below.

4. The fact that formulae with τιε/η and with αττιη alternate is not an argument against our analysis. We find more formulae which are used with or without a preposition. A well-known example is δεως ζεμελως next to με δεως ζεμελως and even once δη διως ζεμελως (4). In the same way, we may analyze inscription 62 as ατ τιη κε δεως κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου "let him become cursed by Tiyes and the gods" *uel sim.* Cf. also § 5 on ατ τι(ε/η) vs. ας τιαν.

Also the asyndetic constructions ζεμελως [τι]ε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (75) and με δεως τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (112) are not without parallel, cf. δεως ζεμελως τι τετικμενος ειτου (93) or με διω[ς ζ]ομολως τι τετικμενος ειτου (5) (cf. Brixhe 1978b: 1).

[4] If the reading of 103 is correct, one may probably divide ατιατιτικμενος as ατια τιτικμενος, ατια being an unusual spelling for ατιη/ε.

More problematic is the syntax of [δεως κε ζεμελως κ]ε τιε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (3), τος νι με ζεμελω κε δεος [κ]ε τιη τιτ τετικμενος ε[ιτ]ου (6), and με ζε⟨με⟩λως κε δεως κε τιε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] (97), as the construction with three members and two times κε (X κε Y κε Z) is otherwise unknown in Phrygian. In constructions with two members, κε is found either after the second member (X Y κε), e. g. δεως ζεμελως κε τιτ τετικμενος ειτου (40), or, more frequently, after each member (X κε Y κε), e. g. με δεως κε ζεμελως κε (96) (Brixhe 1978b: 1 f.). In constructions with three members we would also expect κε after each member, and Brixhe (ibid.: 2) believes he finds X κε Y κε Z κε in two inscriptions, but both cases are uncertain, cf. [ζεμ]ελως{ι} κε δεως [κε αττιε] κε τι τετικμ[ενος ειτου] κε οτ εκτει[(92), which is based on restoration, and ζε]μελως κε [δ]ε[ω]ς με κοννου κε ισνιο[υ] αι παρτης (42), where Brixhe proposes to change με to κε. Consequently, there seems to be no clear counter-example to the syntax X κε Y κε Z.

I believe we must rather assume a mixture of two formulae, viz. με ζεμελως κε δεως κε τι(τ) τετικμενος ειτου and τιε τι(τ) τετικμενος ειτου.

5. The analysis of τιε/ητιττετικμενος as τιε/η τιτ τετικμενος, proposed above, provides further support for the view which I have defended elsewhere (Lubotsky 1988: fn. 11), viz. that two NPhr. apodosis formulae αττι(ε/η) (αδ)ειτου and αστιανειτου must be analysed as follows:

αττι(ε/η) (αδ)ειτου = prep. αδ + dat. sg. τι/τιε/τιη + 3 sg. impv. (αδ)ειτου
αστιαν ειτου = prep. ας + acc. sg. τιαν + 3 sg. impv. ειτου.

Both formulae mean 'let him become cursed by Tiyes' *uel sim.* The difference between these formulae is thus explained by the different prepositions: αδ + dat. vs. ας (< **ēs* < **ens*) + acc. This syntax is confirmed by other inscriptions. For ας + acc. cf. ας σεμουν κνουμαν (31), ας βαταν (33), ας αναν (35) (cf. Neumann 1986: 83). The only other attestation of the preposition αδ/ατ is probably 14 [ι]ος νι σεμουν κνο[υ]μανει κακιν αδδακετ αιν' αδ ατεαμας ... 'whoever brings harm to this grave or to (α)τεαμας ...' where it is used in order to emphasize the dative of (α)τεαμας, which is indeclinable, cf. ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδακετ αινι τιαμας ... (87) or ιος νι σεμον κνουμανει κακον αδακετ αινι σα τ[ο]υ τεαμας (115).

The analysis of αστιανειτου as ας τιαν ειτου was already proposed by R. Meister (Xenia Nicolaitana, p. 168, which was inaccessible to me) and accepted by Calder (1956: XXIX) and Heubeck (1987: 79 f.), who,

however, stick to the view that the ατ̣τι(ε/η) formulae contain the name of the Phrygian god Attis. However, if our analysis of τιε/ητι(τ)τετικμενος is correct, the theory operating with Attis in NPhr. inscriptions can definitively be rejected.

6. The name Tiyes in the nom. sg. is probably attested in the OPhr. inscription M-04 *ạkinanogavaṇ* : *tiyes*| *moḍroṿanak* : *[?]avaṛạ[?]*, where it bears the title *modrovanak* 'King of Modra' (cf. Neumann 1986 a).

Furthermore, the Phrygian town Τίειον is named after this god, cf. the remarks of Stephanus Byzantius: Δημοσθένης δ'ἐν Βιθυνιακοῖς φησὶ κτιστὴν τῆς πόλεως γενέσθαι Πάταρον ἑλόντα Παφλαγονίαν, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τιμᾶν τὸν Δία Τίον προσαγορεῦσαι (cf. on this passage Haas 1966: 67). The name Τίειον contains the suffix *-eịo-*, which is frequently used in Phrygian for the formation of adjectives. The same adjective occurs in NPhr. inscription 58 τιηιον εγεσιτ γεγριμενον, translated by Haas (ibid.) 'er soll das göttliche Vorbestimmte tragen'. This curse is a variant of a frequent NPhr. malediction γεγρειμεναν εγεδου τιος ουταν 'let him get the established punishment of Tiyes' *uel sim.*, which contains the gen. sg. of the name Tiyes.

The case endings of the name Tiyes are those of a consonant stem, and I would propose to reconstruct an *s*-stem (for *-s-* > *-h-* > *-ø-* see Lubotsky 1988: 19 f.):

nom.sg. *tiyes*	< **tiH-es*
acc.sg. τιαν	< **tiH-(e)s-ṃ*, cf. ουανακταν (88)
gen.sg. τιος	< **tiH-s-os*, cf. κ⟨ν⟩ουμινος (5)
dat. sg. τι(ε/η)	< **tiH-s-ei*, cf. κνουμανει/ι/η, βρατερε (31)

7. Accordingly, we may conclude that ετι(τ)τετικμενος does not exist in NPhr. and that the only NPhr. ετι is the conjunction 'and' or adverb 'besides, in addition to', which is very close to the use of Greek ἔτι. The consequences of our analysis are discussed in the following section.

II. τι

8. The word τι is found in most NPhr. malediction formulae, cf., for instance, ιος νι σεμουν κνουμανει κακουν αδδακετ τι ττετικμενος ατ̣τι αδειτου (57), or ιος νι σεμον κνουμανε κακον αδακετ δεως ζεμελως τι τετικμενος ειτου (93). The distribution of NPhr. τι was meticulously analysed by Brixhe in a recent study (1978a: 8 ff.), and his conclusions can be summarized as follows:

a. NPhr. τι generally stands in the apodosis of the malediction formulae, immediately preceding the participle (τ)τετικμενος 'cursed' or the adjective (?) δρεγρουν in the formula ακκε οι βεκος ακκαλος τι δρεγρουν ειτου, found in 33, 76, and 108. This distribution refutes the hypothesis of Haas (1966: 82 ff. *et passim*) that τι is an indefinite pronoun 'irgendein' belonging to κακουν in the protasis and reflecting PIE **k"id.*

b. NPhr. τι is a particle, reinforcing the following participle.

c. NPhr. τι, which is attested three times in the protasis:
ιος νι σ[εμ]ον τ[ου] κνουμαν[ε] κακουν τι [αδ]δακετ (39),
ιος σα τι σκελεδριαι κακουν δακετ (67),
[ιος] σεμον τι κνουμανι κ[ακον α]βερετ (103),
is probably of a different origin and is a variant of τ, το, του, occurring frequently after demonstrative pronouns, cf. σεμιν τ κνουμανει (76), σεμον το (27), σεμουν του (10); σας του σκερεδριας (56), σα του μανκα (82), σα τ(ο)υ τεαμας (115).

d. The etymology explaining τι as a variant of ετι, which was proposed by Dressler (1968: 48) and Gusmani (1967: 325) on the grounds of the parallelism of two constructions, viz. τι ετι(τ)τετικμενος and ετι ετι(τ)τετικμενος, is improbable because the latter construction with the reduplicated ετι does not exist. The apparent occurrences of ετι ετι(τ)τετικμενος go back to τι ετι (τ)τετικμενος (but cf. above, §§ 2 ff.).

e. The particle τι is probably based on the pronominal stem **to-*.

f. NPhr. τι is mostly followed by a geminated consonant, cf. τι ττετικμενος (passim) and τι γγεγαριτμενο⟨ς⟩ (88) vs. ε/οροκα γεγαριτμενος (33, 36).

9. I believe that these results can hardly be contested. The only remaining problem is the gemination. On the one hand, "il est évident que la gémination a, en néo-phrygien, cessé d'être pertinente, cf. les doublets αδδακετ/αδακετ αββερετ/αβερετ, où la géminée est étymologique" (Brixhe 1978a: 14), which may account for some sporadic cases of unetymological gemination, cf. κνουμμανει (44, 53) vs. κνουμανει (*passim*, cf., however, also κνουνμανει 101, 105) or αινι μμυρα (25). On the other hand, the frequency of τι ττετικμενος shows that this explanation does not hold here. Brixhe opts for an alternation between τετικμενος after a consonant (and after a strong boundary) and ττετικμενος after a vowel, which accounts for τι ττετικμενος and ετιττετικμενος.

Haas (1966: 88) explained the gemination after τι by the assimilation of the final consonant of **tid* (according to him. < **k"id*), but in order to account for the double -ττ- in ετιττετικμενος, he reconstructs the

participle as **stetigmenos* < **ste-stig-menos* (to the root of Gr. στίζω 'steche, brandmarke'). This etymology is problematic both from the etymological point of view (Phr. -κ- vs. Gr. -γ-) and the semantic (cf. Heubeck 1987: 74). Moreover, it seems strange that word-initial *st-* yields a geminate, whereas the same sequence in the middle of the word is simplified to *-t-*.

Heubeck (1987: 70 ff.) refers to an old idea of Torp (1984: 14) that the double consonant in ττετικμενος reflects the accent of the preceding τι (= ετί), which is implausible from the phonetic point of view, and which, moreover, would be the only case where the accent is reflected by gemination.

10. Beyond any doubt, the most simple and straightforward explanation of the gemination is to assume with Haas that τι ended in a consonant (most probably, -τ or -δ), which was assimilated to the first consonant of the following word, cf. αδδακεκ γεγρειμ[ε]ναν (32) or αδδεκεμ μανκαι (35) for the usual αδδακετ, αββερετ for αδ-βερετ, or ακκε (33, 76, 108) for αδ-κε.

Nevertheless, both Brixhe (1978a: 8) and Heubeck (1987: 71) explicitly reject this explanation because of ετιττετικμενος where we find the same gemination, but after the preverb ετι, which ends in a vowel. As we have seen above, however, in all apparent cases of ετιττετικμενος the ε belongs to the previous word, so that here again we have τι, followed by gemination. This counter-example being dismissed, nothing prevents us from analyzing τιττετικμενος and τιγγεγαριτμενος as τιτ τετικμενος and τιγ γεγαριτμενος, respectively. For the simple -τ- instead of -ττ- cf. ατι (87, 103) instead of the usual αττι.

These considerations also open new prospects for the analysis of the so-called βεκος-formula, ακκε οι βεκος ακκαλος τιδρεγρουν ειτου (33, 76, 108), as τιδρεγρουν can now be analysed τιδ-ρεγρουν. I hope to return to this formula elsewhere.

As far as the origin of the particle τιδ is concerned, it is likely that this particle reflects the anaphoric pronoun **id* with added *t-* from the pronoun **so*, **sā*, **tod* (cf. the emphatic Skt. particle *íd*, which originally was the same pronoun, only without the *t-*). For the formation compare also the neuter of the West Germanic demonstrative pronoun: OE *þis*, OS *thit*, OHG *diz*, which go back to **tid* (Beekes 1982—3: 218), and the Anatolian reflexive particle **-ti* (Hitt. -*z*, Luw., HLuw., Lyc. *-ti*), which seems to have the same origin (ibid.: 213, cf. also Brixhe 1978a: 14).

References

Beekes, R. S. P. 1982–3: On Laryngeals and Pronouns, KZ 96, 200–232.

Brixhe, Cl. 1978a: Études neo-phrygiennes I, Verbum 1,1, 3–21.

Brixhe, Cl. 1978b: Études neo-phrygiennes II, Verbum 1,2, 1–22.

Brixhe, Cl. 1979: Études neo-phrygiennes III, Verbum 2,2, 177–192.

Brixhe, Cl. – Lejeune, M. 1984: Corpus des inscriptions paléo-phrygiennes. 2 vols. Paris.

Brixhe, Cl. – Neumann, G. 1985: Découverte du plus long texte néo-phrygien: l'inscription de Gezler Köyü, Kadmos 24/2, 161–184.

Calder, W. M. 1911: Corpus inscriptionum neo-phrygiarum. JHSt. 31, 161–215.

Calder, W. M. 1913: Corpus inscriptionum neo-phrygiarum II. JHSt. 33, 97–104.

Calder, W. M. 1933: Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua IV. Manchester.

Calder, W. M. 1956: Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua VII. Manchester.

Cox, C. W. M. – Cameron, A. 1932: A native inscription from the Myso-Phrygian Borderland. Klio 25, 34–49.

Dressler, W. 1968: Review of Haas 1966, Die Sprache 13, 40–49.

Gusmani, R. 1958: Studi sull'antico frigio, RIL 92, 835–69, and Le iscrizioni dell'antico frigio, RIL 92, 870–903.

Gusmani, R. 1967: Review of Haas 1966, IF 72, 232–238.

Haas, O. 1966: Die Phrygischen Sprachdenkmäler, Sofia.

Heubeck, A. 1987: Phrygiaka I–III. KZ 100, 70–85.

Laminger-Pascher, G. 1984: Beiträge zu den griechischen Inschriften Lycaoniens. Wien.

Lejeune, M. 1969: Discussions sur l'alphabet phrygien, SMEA 10, 19–47.

Lubotsky, A. 1988: The Old Phrygian Areyastis-inscription. Kadmos 27, 1988, 9–26.

Neumann, G. 1970: Das phrygische Pronomen σεμο-. KZ 84, 211–215.

Neumann, G. 1986: Zur Syntax der neuphrygischen Inschrift Nr. 31. Kadmos 25/1, 79–84.

Neumann, G. 1986a: Modrovanak, Epigraphica Anatolica 8, 52.

Ramsay, W. M. 1905: Neo-Phrygian Inscriptions. Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien VIII (Beiblatt), 79–120.

Torp, A. 1884: Zu den phrygischen Inschriften aus römischer Zeit. Christiania.